

be inordinately high, however, the Oil Pollution Act required that the Department of Transportation undertake a study and propose a lower limit if appropriate. The Coast Guard study was completed in October 1993. It concluded that the use of deepwater ports is the least risky means of importing crude oil to the United States and that a lower liability limit is appropriate. The rulemaking to lower LOOP's liability limit was initiated on February 8, 1995. It could reduce the liability limit from its present level at \$350 million to \$50 million—a \$300 million difference, yet the economic impact of this change, as I think the committee intended it to be measured, will be much more limited, consisting primarily of the lower annual insurance costs LOOP will incur which reflect the lower risk associated with deepwater ports such as LOOP. Am I correct in understanding that the proposed rule to lower LOOP's liability limit would not be considered a significant rule under the substitute, and therefore would take effect without a 45-day delay?

Mr. NICKLES. The Senator has an excellent point. Although our substitute provides that the administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs makes the determinations of what will qualify as "significant rules," it appears clear on its face that in this case, the measurement of the economic impact of the regulation would be the cost savings to LOOP, not the dollar amount by which its liability limit is reduced, and therefore in my opinion, it probably would not be considered a significant rule by OIRA for purposes of this legislation.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I thank the Senator for his interpretation of the standard of measurement for economic impact and its application to the rule reducing LOOP's liability limit.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 417 TO AMENDMENT NO. 410

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows: The Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], for himself and Mr. GLENN, proposes an amendment numbered 417 to amendment No. 410.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 14 of the amendment, line 2, strike the period and insert: ", except that such

term does not include any rule of particular applicability including a rule that approves or prescribes for the future rates, wages, prices, services, or allowances therefor, corporate or financial structures, reorganizations, mergers, or acquisitions thereof, or accounting practices or disclosures bearing on any of the foregoing or any rule of agency organization, personnel, procedure, practice or any routine matters."

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, agencies issue probably thousands of rules each year that pertain only to one person or business. These are rules that are issued on a routine basis—opening a bridge, changing a flight path, exempting a person from meeting general standards that do not apply to that person's particular situations. I do not think these rules are included in that 4,000 count that we sometimes use as the rules that would be covered by this legislative review provision.

These are the rules of specific, particular applicability that have no general applicability, and that it is not our intent, I believe—I should not say that, but I do not believe it is the intent of the makers of the substitute here—to cover by the substitute.

So this amendment makes it clear that these rules of particular applicability and these routine rules are not covered by this legislative review substitute.

I believe the amendment has been cleared by the managers of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I appreciate my colleague's amendment. We have worked with him and his staff on this amendment. We have no objections and urge its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I compliment the Senator from Michigan for his work on this. He has worked long and hard on rules and regulations in the Governmental Affairs Committee. This is one example of how thorough he is in these areas.

Even though we can pass laws—we can pass rules and regulations—there are coincidences that apply in particular cases or places, or things are found to be unfair with the local people. And, where that can be corrected, it should be corrected.

This provides for that kind of a correction where otherwise people would be dealt with very unfairly by their government. We are trying to make this as fair as possible for everybody.

That is what the Senator from Michigan is doing. I compliment him and am glad to cosponsor his amendment.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. President, I do not know of any further debate on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment (No. 417) is agreed to.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GLENN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

REINVENTING GOVERNMENT

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, a little while ago the majority leader spoke on the floor regarding the administration's Reinventing Government proposal.

The majority leader suggested that the President has jumped on the budget-cutting bandwagon and that he has done so in response to the November 1994 election.

Mr. President, the President and the Vice President, since before the November 1992 election, have stated and proven their commitment to the process of streamlining government. The proposal announced yesterday has been labeled "REGO II," because it is the second phase in a Reinventing Government process that began over 2 years ago.

Through that process headed by Vice President GORE, we have already taken steps to cut back the Federal Government. The Federal work force is today the smallest it has been since John Kennedy was in the White House. The proposal announced yesterday would cut \$13.1 billion and eliminate 4,805 Government positions over the next 5 years.

Reinventing Government has been an ongoing, thoughtful process based on careful analysis of the ways with which to cut the bureaucracy while ensuring the Government's ability to meet our policy goals.

To suggest that the President or the Vice President have jumped on the bandwagon is off base.

The majority leader also suggested that the rescissions bill the Senate is about to consider will provide immediate savings and is, therefore, superior to the President's Reinventing Government proposal.

First, Mr. President, the administration's Reinventing Government proposal and the rescissions package are not in competition. It is not an either/or. We can and should cut waste and streamline Government whenever and wherever it makes sense and fits within our national priorities.

But if the comparison is going to be made, it should be accurate. I would hate for anyone to be left with the impression that the Republican rescissions package provides over \$13 billion in cash savings in fiscal year 1995, because it does not.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, the proposal would cut \$13.2 billion in budget authority in fiscal year 1995, but the outlay savings would be \$11.48 billion spread over the next 5 years. The analysis from CBO shows that, while \$13.2 billion in budget authority would be cut in fiscal year 1995,

the Republican proposal would cut only \$1.138 billion in outlays in fiscal year 1995.

I ask unanimous consent that a CBO analysis issued today on the rescissions package be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY: SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS ACT, 1995 (S. 617), STATUS: SENATE REPORTED

[Note: estimates based on April 1, 1995 enactment; by fiscal year, in millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays—				
		1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
Emergencies						
Fiscal year 1995	1,900	335	67	1,498	0	0
Contingent Emergencies						
Fiscal year 1996	4,800	0	0	346	1,981	2,474
Supplementals						
Fiscal year 1995	2	(15)	20	304	99	0
Discretionary	(7)	(24)	20	304	99	0
Mandatory	9	9	0	0	0	0
Fiscal year 1996	251	0	(41)	22	0	0
Fiscal year 1997	(40)	0	0	(60)	21	0
Fiscal year 1998	(39)	0	0	0	(43)	3
Total, Fiscal years 1995–98	174	(15)	(21)	265	77	3
Discretionary	165	(24)	(21)	265	77	3
Mandatory	9	9	0	0	0	0
Rescissions						
Fiscal year 1995	(13,152)	(1,138)	(2,939)	(2,454)	(1,981)	(2,912)
Emergencies	(62)	(*)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(4)
Non-Emergencies	(13,090)	(1,138)	(2,937)	(2,452)	(1,979)	(2,908)
Fiscal year 1996—Non-Emergencies	(26)	0	(26)	0	0	0
Fiscal year 1997—Non-Emergencies	(29)	0	0	(29)	0	0
Total Fiscal years 1995–97	(13,208)	(1,138)	(2,965)	(2,484)	(1,981)	(2,912)
Emergencies	(62)	(*)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(4)
Non-Emergencies	(13,146)	(1,138)	(2,963)	(2,481)	(1,979)	(2,908)
Total Bill						
FY 1995–98:						
Emergencies	6,700	335	67	1,844	1,981	2,474
Supplementals	174	(15)	(21)	265	77	3
Rescissions	(13,208)	(1,138)	(2,965)	(2,484)	(1,981)	(2,912)
Total	(6,334)	(818)	(2,919)	(374)	77	(435)

*Congressional Budget Office, Mar. 28, 1995.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I hope we can avoid the politicization of the debate about reorganizing government. Democrats and Republicans both recognize the need to reinvent government, to find ways to run our Federal Government in a much more efficient manner.

The President and the Vice President should be congratulated—not criticized—for leading the effort to find new ways, going all the way back to the very beginning of this administration, to both reduce the cost and the size of government in a meaningful way.

With that, I yield the floor.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REGULATORY TRANSITION ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be added as a cosponsor to the pending substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I support the substitute. I have supported what we call legislative review—the earlier form being called legislative veto—not only when I got to the U.S. Senate but before I got to the U.S. Senate. It was actually, believe it or not, part of my election platform when I first ran for the U.S. Senate in 1978, because I believed that elected officials should have the responsibility to review important regulations of the bureaucracy.

I found, as a local official, that I was too often confronted with regulations which had major impacts on my community, and I was told, if you want to go and complain about those regulations, go to the agencies somewhere out in the yonder somewhere, see if you can find that agency or the regional office of that agency somewhere. I was shunted around from unelected official to unelected official.

I wanted very much to have an elected person accountable to me for major regulations, be it an elected President or be it an elected Member of Congress.

So I very much supported legislative veto starting in 1979 when I worked with Elliott Levitas in the House and Harrison Schmitt in the Senate on Government-wide legislative veto, as well as a specific provision for the Federal Trade Commission.

As a matter of fact, Senator Ribicoff, who was then chairman of the Governmental Affairs Committee, held a series of hearings on regulatory reform, did a major study which was the basis for an omnibus regulatory reform bill called S. 1080 that passed the Senate in 1982 but died in the House.

I sponsored the legislative veto provision that was added to the FTC. The reason we did that was because of some major controversial rulings of the FTC relative to used-car dealers and funeral directors and other major industries and segments of our economy.

Senator Schmitt and I, in March 1982, offered a Government-wide legislative review amendment to the regulatory reform bill that I have made reference to. And some of the same key players